AUG 1 5 2005

Certification of Mulling or Facsis hereby certify that I have see adiested below: fas pumber 571-273-8300 MIL

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.

10/764,931

Applicant(s)

Peter Robert Foley, et al.

Filed

January 26, 2004

Title

CLEANING COMPOSITION

TC/A.U.

1751

Examiner

Greogry R. Delcotto

Conf. No.

9645

Docket No.

CM-2491D

Customer No.

27752

## RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## Dear Sir:

This is responsive to the Office Action mailed March 25, 2005.

Claims 1-6 are pending, and of these claims, Claim 1 has been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. Claims 2-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as purportedly being obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0010106 A1, Uchiyama, et al. The Office Action states that the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA.

The Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Uchiyama, et al. patent application does not meet either criteria to constitute prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). The Uchiyama, et al. patent application published on January 24, 2002, and, thus, was not published before the invention under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)(1). The Uchiyama, et al. patent application is not a patent, and, thus, does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)(2).

Therefore, the rejection is not proper under Section 103, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted, PETER ROBERT FOLEY, ET AL.

By

Jeffrey V. Camber Attorney for Applicant(s) Registration No. 31,148 (513) 627-4597

August 15, 2005 Customer No. 27752 CM2491D Response 8-2005.doc